REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

Drawings

Applicants have submitted herewith replacement sheets of drawings.

Claim Objections

Claims 23 and 24 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claims 9 and claim 10 respectively. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that in the previous response, claim 1 was amended to include the limitation of claims 5 and 6. Claim 9 depend from claim 1 and thus includes all limitations of claim 1 via dependency. Claim 23 does not include the amended limitations of claim 1 and thus is clearly distinguishable.

Claims 20 and 25-26 are objected to because of certain informalities. These claims have been amended to remove informalities.

Claim Rejections under 35 USC §102

Claims 1 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Warburton et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants' representative had a telephone conversation with the Examiner regarding the rejection of amended claim1 and the Examiner indicated that claims 1-19 have been allowed.

As to claim 25, the Examiner has stated that Warburton et al. discloses "*determining* the widths (**TSs for the first and the second peaks in FIG.8A**) of the plurality of peak portions" (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that TSs are not widths of peak portions but they are actually the sampling time, which is the distance between midpoints of

slow peak and the fast peak (*see* col. 19, lines 9-13). Accordingly, Warburton et al. does not teach this limitation.

Further, the Examiner has stated that "*applying* and *varying* the variable width of one of shaping responses (FIG.8A, 196 one of the fast filter outputs) to the corresponding one of the peak portions (the first and the second) of the signal, **wherein the width shaping response 196 is varied from TW to TM** (FIG.8G)" (Emphasis added). Applicants respectfully point to the Examiner that TW is the width of each fast pulse and TM is actually a maximum width parameter that is loaded from a DSP. The width TW is "compared" with the maximum parameter TM. (*see* col. 21, lines 40-45). Thus, Warburton et al. does not teach varying width from TW to TM as the Examiner has stated.

<p align="center">*Claim Rejections under 35 USC § 103*</p>

Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCaslin et al. (US 5,668,794) in view of Melas et al. (US 5,293,369). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Claim 20 has been amended to include the limitation of claim 22, which has been indicated to be allowable.

Applicant believes this application and the claims herein to be in a condition for allowance. Please charge any additional fees, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0668. Should the Examiner have further inquiry concerning these matters, please contact the below named attorney for Applicant.

<div align="right">
Respectfully submitted,
/Abdul Zindani/

Abdul Zindani
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 46,091
</div>

Texas Instruments Incorporated
P.O. Box 655474, MS 3999
Dallas, TX   75265
(972) 917-5137